

Petition against Sri T. M. Rangayya Setty, Municipal Councillor of Chintamani Town.

Q.—578. Sri M. C. ANJANEYA REDDY (Chintamani).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the date on which the Sub-Division Officer of Chikballapur Sub-Division submitted his report to the Commissioner with reference to the petition received by the Commissioner for Local Self-Government from one Sri A. C. Veerabhadrapa of Chintamani Town alleging that Sri T. M. Rangayya Setty, a Municipal Councillor of Chintamani Town, has acted against the interests of the said municipality?

(b) whether it is a fact that the Commissioner had called for the views of the Municipal Council in respect of the misconduct of the said Sri T. M. Rangayya Setty;

(c) if so, on what date;

(d) the date on which the Municipal Council sent up their decision unanimously recommending for his removal in accordance with Section 16 of the Town Municipal Act;

(e) the reason for not disposing of this matter so far?

A.—Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(a) 14th July 1954.

(b) Yes.

(c) On 2nd September 1954.

(d) On 6th September 1954.

(e) Some records which are required for a full consideration of the case are not made available yet.

Landless agricultural families.

Q.—815. Sri S. R. NAGAPPA SETTY (Shimoga).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the number of landless agricultural families in the State;

(b) whether they would consider to register the agricultural families in the State who are entirely depending

on agriculture as tenants and consider such registered agricultural families while granting lands?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(a) The information is not available.

(b) No.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

***Re*: Adverse effect of incidence of Sales-Tax on Agricultural Produce.**

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy has given notice of an adjournment motion as follows :—

“This House do now stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence to wit the situation arising out of the non-disposal of agricultural produce, groundnut by the growers after the introduction of the new system of sales-tax from 1st April, whereby the agriculturist is made to pay sales-tax on his produce which has resulted in accumulation of huge stocks in the market yards at Davangere, Tumkur and Mysore Regulated Markets and thus causing hardship to the raiyats and breakdown of normal trade.”

The matter is no doubt of great public importance. But, the new system of sales-tax referred to in the motion, though stated to come into force from the 1st of April, is as a result of an amending Act passed quite some time ago by the Legislature.

I also learn that the Rules under which the levy is made was published on 2-2-1955 and objections were called for and it is only thereafter that the levy has come into force. Therefore there was enough time for the Mover to bring this matter before the Assembly earlier.

It is also clear that any change in the method of levy has to be by legislation. It has been laid down that when an alteration in the law

(MR. SPEAKER.)

which is complained of is required, then the method is not by an adjournment motion.

As stated by Mr. Speaker Peel as early as 1894, "What I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency. But I do not think it was contemplated that a question of very wide scope, which would demand legislation to deal with it in any effective manner should be the subject of discussion."

In the circumstances, the adjournment motion is not in order and I therefore disallow it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I would like to know if the Hon'ble Minister is contemplating to bring an amendment to the Sales Tax Act very soon. What is the intention of Government?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—I am examining the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Since, yesterday, during discussion, the Government also admitted that the report of the committee was otherwise, they will take necessary action.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, yesterday the Hon'ble Minister said emphatically that Government want to bring an amendment and today, the Hon'ble Minister says that he wants to examine. Why is this inconsistency, Sir?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Even yesterday, I submitted that I am examining the matter and actively considering the subject.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—It is a very urgent matter.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I understand. The only solution would be to shift this commodity from the single point levy to the multi-point levy.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—The entire market is paralysed.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I am fully aware of it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—If necessary and if the matter is so grave, I would suggest to Government to bring in an ordinance....

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—We are sitting here and we cannot draw an ordinance. I am drafting an amendment. I will consult some Hon'ble members before taking a final decision.

12-30 P. M.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Re. Delayed Publication of the Results of Sakti-Vishistadwaita Examination.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have got another adjournment motion to be disposed of before taking up any other business. Sri Linganna has sent up an adjournment motion which is as follows:—

"This House do stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of public importance and of recent occurrence, namely, the delayed publication of the results of Sakti-Vishistadwaita Examinations of the State on April 7th 1955 resulting in the prevention of the failed candidates from appearing for the 1955 examination in the usual course."

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I may submit that there is a short notice question also covering this issue. Further, Sir, this is not a matter of public importance because it concerns just a few students against whom there was a charge of corruption and leakage of papers. It was considered and a very sympathetic view was taken and the results were announced. No doubt there was some delay because the matter had to be investigated at length. My submission therefore is that it is not a matter of public importance and it concerns just a few students. In view of the fact that there is a short notice question on this subject technically also, this adjournment motion is not admissible.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—I want to know whether the Minister wants to admit Short Notice Question. In that case, I am not pressing this adjournment motion at all.